

Remarks

Claims 1-11, 13-24, 16-23, 26, and 28-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9, 10, 17, 26, and 28 are amended, and claims 8 and 30 are cancelled without prejudice. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - § 112

The Examiner contends that the disclosure of application no. 60/455,483, to which this application claims priority, fails to provide adequate support under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for the amendments submitted in the 4/14/09 amendment.

The amendments to the claims to which the Examiner refers have been undone and new amendments have been made merely to facilitate expedient prosecution of the application.

Support for the above amendments is at least found within p.2 and p. 6 of application no. 60/455,483.

Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph are moot in view of the new amendments.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections- § 103

Claims 1-11, 13-14, 16-23, 26, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0002521 to Traversat in view of “Semantic Web based Peer-to-Peer Service Registry Network” to Thaden, as set forth by pages 4-14 of the Final Office Action.

Traversat and Thaden, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, *searches the identity files posted on the P2P network to determine at least one device of the end-user devices for a VOIP session and wherein each identity file includes a tag representing information for a VOIP process of the end-user*, as recited in amended claim 1.

Traversat teaches (in para. 64) methods for peers in a peer-to-peer environment to discover one another. Tranversat also teaches (in para. 175) exchange of advertisements of an XML format between peers.

However, unlike claim 1, Traversat does not establish a VOIP session between the discovered peers. Further, unlike the identity files of claim 1, the advertisements of Traverstat do not include a tag representing information for a VOIP process. Indeed, there is no mention of VOIP in Tranversat. Further, the deficiencies of Traversat in this regard, are not cured by Thaden. For example, Thaden teaches (in p. 2 and 4) use of Web Service Descriptions having tags, but none of the tags relate to VOIP.

Traversat and Thaden, alone or in combination, also do not disclose or suggest, *wherein each identity file is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) file that is posted in a public shared directory on an end-user device and accessible using a P2P protocol*, as recited in amended claim 1.

Unlike the identity files of claim 1, the advertisements of Traversat are not posted

in a public shared directory that is accessible using a P2P protocol. The Examiner suggests (in p. 12 of the Final Action) that the advertisements of Traversat are stored on peer nodes and essentially that peer nodes are inherently shared directories. However, a peer node is not a directory (e.g., a peer node typically corresponds to a computer). Indeed a peer node may only include non-shared directories. Further, Traversat merely teaches (in para. 172) exchange of advertisement documents between peers, but not posting of the documents in a public shared directory that is accessible using a P2P protocol. Indeed, there would be no reason to exchange the documents between peers on Traversat if the documents were accessible from a public shared directory. Further, the deficiencies of Traversat in this regard, are not cured by Thaden.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Traversat and Thaden fail to disclose or suggest, *searches the identity files posted on the P2P network to determine at least one device of the end-user devices for a VOIP session, wherein each identity file is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) file that is posted in a public shared directory on an end-user device and accessible using a P2P protocol, and wherein each identity file includes a tag representing information for a VOIP process of the end-user*, as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Traversat and Thaden.

Claims 10, 17, and 28 are believed to be patentable over Traversat and Thaden for at least similar reasons to claim 1. For example, claim 10 has been amended to recite *performing a search by the seeker device on a public shared directory of the P2P network for identity files having an Extensible Markup Language (XML) format*, claim 17 has been amended to recite *initiating a voice over internet protocol (VOIP) session with the collaborators*, and claim 28 has been amended to recite *initiating a voice over internet protocol (VOIP) session with the collaborators, wherein each identity file is an*

Extensible Markup Language (XML) file that is posted in a public shared directory that is accessible using a P2P protocol, and wherein each identity file includes a tag representing information for a VOIP process.

The dependent claims are believed patentable over Traversat and Thaden at least by virtue of their dependence from their base claims.

Claims 8 and 30 are cancelled without prejudice.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By: Donald B. Paschburg
Donald B. Paschburg
Reg. No. 33,753
Attorney for Applicant

Correspondence Address:

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
609-734-3680